

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 are independent claims. The claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Those rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended in the manner presented below in the Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview. New Claims 18-20 have been added. Thus, upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-20 will be pending. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found in the Applicant's specification on at least page 44, lines 6-10, and Fig. 23.

Before discussing the substance of the examiner interview, a brief review of the Applicants' disclosure may be helpful without limiting the claims. The Applicant's disclosure is directed to a method and apparatus for updating a lookup table. Referring to Fig. 23 of the Applicant's specification, access is provided to a first set of routes (r6, h1) that are stored in the nodes of a first subtree (B₂ 2006) that is part of a larger tree. During an update of the lookup table (in this case, the addition of route h2), a second set of routes (r6, h1, h2) is stored in the nodes of a second subtree (B₂' 2008), which is separate from the larger tree. Both sets of routes are accessed through pointers to their respective subtree root nodes (a first pointer and a second pointer). During the update, the first set of routes (r6, h1) in the first subtree (B₂ 2006) remains accessible to the lookup table via the first pointer. In order for the lookup table to gain access to the updated routes (r6, h1, h2) in the second subtree (B₂' 2008), access is switched from the first set of routes to the second set of routes by replacing the first pointer with the second pointer and, therefore, replacing the first subtree (B₂ 2006) with the second subtree (B₂' 2008). In some embodiments, switching access from the first set of routes to the second set of routes is implemented by "logic," which is not meant to be interpreted as a means-plus-function term. One skilled in the art would understand that such logic may be implemented using specific hardware or software based structures. (See Applicant's Specification, page 43, line 12 – page 45, line 6, and Fig. 23.)

Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview

Applicant's Attorney thanks Examiner Hom for a helpful telephonic interview on October 23, 2007 with the undersigned regarding the pending case. During the interview, Fig. 23 of the present application and Figs. 13-16 of U.S. Patent No. 5,384,568 to Grinberg *et al.* were discussed. Applicants suggested amending the claims to recite that the second set of routes (stored in the second subtree) is derived from the first set of routes (stored in the first subtree). For example, in the embodiment described above, the second set of routes (r6, h1, h2) is derived by copying the first set of routes (r6, h1) from the first subtree (B₂ 2006) to the second subtree (B₂' 2008), and adding at least one additional route (h2) to the second subtree (B₂' 2008).

During the course of the interview it was understood that none of the cited references discloses a second set of routes that is derived from a first set of routes, and that the above amended claims would distinguish the cited references. The examiner stated that upon receipt of the amended claims a further search would be performed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 11-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grinberg *et al.* (U.S. patent No. 5,384,568) in view of Tzeng (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,574). Claims 2, 6, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grinberg *et al.* and Tzeng in view of Nakatsu *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,787,151).

As presented above, independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, as amended, are believed to be novel and non-obvious over the cited references. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 14-20 directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1, 5, 9, or 13 and are, therefore, believed to be novel and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the same reasons as presented above for Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13.

Accordingly, the present invention, as claimed, is not believed to be anticipated or made obvious by the cited or prior art. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and acceptance of Claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (Claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Patrick A. Quinlan

Registration No. 61,287
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 10/30/07